The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives news accounts and editorial interpretations of matters affecting labor occurring in the industrial, legislative, and judicial fields, and contains other information of benefit to the trade union movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1913, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 11, 1918.

WE PLEDGE—
1 BILLION DOLLARS
IN
WAR SAVINGS BONDS
FOR VICTORY

WHOLE NO. 1749 — WILLIAM GREEN, President — WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1944 — GEORGE MEANY, Secretary-Treasurer — VOL. 34, NO. 42

FACING the FACTS
With PHILIP PEARL

There are all shades and varieties of newspaper columnists. Some are reactionary, some conservative; a few may be considered liberal and a tiny number undoubtedly radical. The views they express are often their own personal convictions, but occasionally these convictions are influenced by the policy of the newspapers which purchase and print the column.

Now David Lawrence is in a unique position among newspaper columnists. He not only writes a daily column which is offered for sale and carried by various newspapers but he is a publisher in his own right. He publishes the United States News and a group of informational services which are offered for sale to businessmen.

Under the circumstances, it is not a bit surprising that Mr. Lawrence's views are conservative. Some writers in the radical camp even regard Mr. Lawrence as a reactionary. We have never shared this estimate of Mr. Lawrence because he usually has a high regard for facts and fairness—traits not often discernible among reactionary writers.

The Army Fact Sheets

All of this leads up to an expression of the deep disappointment we felt when we read Mr. Lawrence's column published Oct. 16 in the Washington Star.

Apparently, Mr. Lawrence was carried away by the intensity of his political feeling. He accused the War Department and the United States Army of playing politics in favor of the Administration by sending out to Army orientation officers "fact sheets" giving fair and well-balanced information with regard to labor's war record.

Mr. Lawrence makes the mistake of implying that these facts sheets may have been sent out by some "New Deal underlings" able "to persuade gullible officers unfamiliar with the maneuvers of politics." But the fact sheets, as a casual glance at them will disclose, are official statements of policy by the War Department and are issued by General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army, under the authority of the Secretary of War.

Furthermore, we challenge any fair-minded person to read these fact sheets and discover any trace of partisan politics in them. The conclusion of Fact Sheet No. 29 states that the production record of management and labor in this war has been "magnificent." Is there any politics in that? Have not both the Republican and Democratic platforms and the Presidential candidates of both parties conceded that?

Is The Truth Unfair?

Mr. Lawrence considers it unfair and unsportsmanlike for the War Department to tell the troops that the loss of time due to strikes in this country has amounted to "less than one-tenth of one per cent of the total labor time available."

He declares that Army Fact Sheet No. 33, dated Aug. 21, 1944, which contained this statement "is a plain violation of law and some one ought to be prosecuted for it."

We have yet to find any law in the United States which makes illegal a statement of fact—a statement of plain truth, designed to strengthen the nation's war effort.

Before Mr. Lawrence sounded off we never discovered the slightest hint that either side regards labor's war record as a campaign issue.

Both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey in their Labor Day messages and in their campaign speeches have given high praise to labor's accomplishments in the war production program. In case Mr. Lawrence has forgotten it, we quote here what Governor Dewey said in his Labor Day proclamation:

"The stirring news of victory after victory on the fighting fronts is cause for pride not only in the theater of war but on the home front. Without the superb cooperation of working men and women here at home it would have been impossible to send out our magnificently equipped armies to attack the enemies of freedom. In this all Americans may rejoice and take pride, but particularly the working men and women who are making for our fighting men the weapons with which they are giving us victory. In New York we take special pride in the patriotism of labor. Since Pearl Harbor there has not been a single major strike in New York."

Now, Mr. Lawrence, in the light of these facts, aren't you a little mixed up and don't you want to apologize for what you wrote?

Labor And The G. I. Joes

(Following are excerpts from address by the International Representative of the AFL before the New York Times Forum, Oct. 10.)

By ROBERT J. WATT

The first item on the post-war program of the American Federation of Labor is to assure a fair deal for the returning service men. We want to see that they get jobs at which they can earn a decent and constantly improving standard of living. We ask these opportunities not as charity nor as a bonus. We ask them because we know that the very existence of our democracy depends upon the maintenance of employment opportunities. We ask them because we don't want an economy of scarcity that creates unrest and which ends in periodic splurges of the worst kind of extravagance—the wastage of human beings.

We share the eagerness and insistence of those concentrating their concern upon jobs for service men, but we disagree with those who believe the problem can be solved by merely putting all returning soldiers and sailors back into their old jobs. We believe our problem is to provide steady jobs at decent wages and good conditions for returning service men. We believe that will be possible only if industrial and commercial activity is sustained by steady jobs at decent wages and good conditions for all who want to work for wages.

We must face this problem on the broad basis instead of doctoring our ailments and disregarding the causes. Unless we tackle the big, fundamental problems of a sane economic system and recognize that the well-being of the veteran depends upon the well-being of the community as a whole, we shall not succeed in solving our problem.

We face not merely the problem of fitting 10,000,000 returning service men into useful employment, but the task of converting 10,000,000 or more war workers into civilian jobs.

It will take more than a G. I. Bill of Rights to do the job. If peace should come tomorrow, and if every service man not needed in the peacetime forces were brought home, and placed in jobs, and present jobholders discharged, the re-employed service man, and every citizen would still face the problem of finding jobs for the 8 or 10 million displaced workers, plus a huge number of unemployed war industry workers.

Many questions already have arisen regarding reinstatement rights of veterans, and who is entitled to these rights. In countless contracts, labor unions have protected these rights by provisions for re-employment. We have not relied alone upon the complicated provisions of the Selective Service Act. In fact, we don't yet know whether the veterans must compete with each other for available jobs. We probably won't know until it is decided by the courts whether the status of the veteran was frozen when he left, or whether his rights accumulated during his services in the armed services.

We face this problem by assuming that everyone, whether employer or worker, wants to see to it that the returning service man will receive his old status as a worker, with the rights he would have had if he had kept at his job. Unfortunately, many of the 11,000,000 service men were not regular employes in civilian occupations when they left. Selective Service interpretations hold that reinstatement rights apply only to so-called permanent workers.

If the individual himself had taken the place of a person who had enlisted, or if the position were a wartime job that will cease after the war, or if the job were based on an individual contract of employment for a limited period, we are informed no right of reinstatement exists. On the other hand, if the veteran were a so-called permanent employe, we are informed that he has an absolute right of reinstatement even if it causes the layoff of a man with much greater length of service.

The legislation I refer to is recent and confused. The language is vague and indefinite. It is full of loopholes. An employer need not reinstate if it is "unreasonable or impossible" to do so. That word "unreasonable" can mean almost anything. We don't know if there are more veterans than there are available jobs how they determine who comes first. The veterans must be qualified to perform their former duties. We don't know who will determine whether they can or not. The employer cannot "discharge without cause" for one year after reinstatement. We don't know whether lay-offs under this section are considered as discharges.

We don't see the equity in this program, even among veterans. The program as it now stands throws the burden of legal enforcement upon the courts. We doubt whether the courts are equipped to handle the number of cases that may arise. Complicated and prolonged court procedures will discourage veterans from efforts to obtain their rights and may lead to widespread violation.

This suggestion may be too simple, but would it not be better to say that the veterans will have the right of reinstatement and tenure, to which their service on the job, plus the period of military service would entitle them? The practical problems could then be settled within the well-established grievance procedure existing under labor-management contracts wherever they exist.

We hope we will, in the next session of Congress, extend Federal old age and survivors' insurance to all wage-earners, establish real federal employment insurance to all wage-earners and provide health insurance against loss of income due to illness or injury. We believe these goals are as important to veterans as to any other workers and to their families. We believe it is unfortunate that we have fallen into the practice of setting up special systems for veterans instead of weaving a social insurance system for service men and workers alike. It would not be difficult to make any necessary extra provisions for the peculiar problems of veterans.

Army Gives Troops Factual Report On Labor's "Magnificent" Record

Washington, D. C.—The War Department, in a series of "fact sheets" sent to its 175,000 "orientation officers," has acknowledged officially that "the production front record of management and labor is magnificent."

The orientation staff of the U. S. Army leads and directs discussions of public issues at army camps and stations, thereby helping the millions of G. I. Joes to get a better understanding of what they are fighting for.

The action by the War Department in providing the troops with factual information regarding strikes, wages and production—matters about which so much misinformation has been spread in the press and the radio—is just what the American Federation of Labor had urged the Army to do for many months.

Fact Sheet No. 29 introduces the subject material with the following note to the orientation officers:

"Confidence in the home front and a feeling of unity with the civilian production workers are essential to the morale of the soldier. Few things will undermine the soldier's faith in his cause more devastatingly than bitterness about the home front. Similarly, few things will do more to undermine his confidence in democratic processes when he returns after the war than the feeling that he was let down by the people at home. Such a feeling would do much to promote a 'we'll take it over' attitude. So it is imperative that we concern ourselves with the soldier's attitude toward the home front—and the information upon which that attitude is formed.

The official Army publication then continues:

"Much has been said about the miracles of American war production since Pearl Harbor. Production of all types of munitions doubled, tripled and quadrupled during 1942 and 1943. No need here to recite statistics. But we should look at the main reasons for this tremendous increase.

"The Axis threat to our existence was met by a tightening of national unity throughout our whole national life. On the production front is appeared as a high degree of cooperation between management and labor which neither had dreamed of before. Cooperation to improve and boost production became the rule of American war industry. It is generally recognized by the leaders of government, business and labor alike that without this cooperation between labor and management, we could not have climbed to the record peaks of production. Similarly, we would not be able to set another 20% increase in war production for 1944 as an attainable goal.

"There are two chief phases of this cooperation on the production front: (1), the widespread establishment of plant 'Labor-Management Committees,' and (2) the pledge of the organized labor movement, amounting to between 11 and 12 million workers, not to strike for the duration of the war.

"Many changes have taken place in wartime industry. The tempo of production has increased; the pattern of industrial relations has altered. Those of us who have been in the service several years may be carrying with us an out-of-date mental picture of management-labor relations. The old bickerings have largely been laid aside in the joint effort to increase the flow of weapons for the armed forces. This Fact Sheet is designed to bring us up-to-date on these changes."

The publication then proceeds to explain the operation of the labor-management committees which have been set up in 4,500 plants employing over seven million war workers. It says:

"The core of the Labor-Management Committee plan is the pooling of ideas for increasing production.

"During the past year American workers have turned in over 1,000,000 suggestions through their Labor-Management Committees. Over 1,500 have received national awards. Thousands of others have been publicized, resulting in the saving of millions of man-hours and millions of pounds of critical materials.

Taking up the subject of wartime strikes, the Army publication refers first to the no-strike pledge given by labor immediately after Pearl Harbor and the creation of the National War Labor Board. It continues:

"Representatives of management and labor voluntarily agreed to accept the decisions of the board. They spoke for the vast majority of their groups, but they could not, however, control every local union and every individual employer. As a result, there have been some strikes and local stoppages. These cases, in which irresponsible unions or irresponsible employers have put their own interests above the nation's have been very few as compared with those where board decisions have been accepted by both parties.

"During the first year after Pearl Harbor, the amount of working time lost on account of strikes was 1/20 of 1% of the available working time. In 1943, due to widespread strikes in the coal mining industry, the number of man-days lost on account of strikes increased over 1942. The total for 1943 was 13½ million man-days lost. Even this total was only 14/100 of 1% of the available working time. Approximately 2/3 of the strike idleness during 1943, according to the Monthly Labor Review, February 1944, was due to the coal mining strikes.

"The no-strike, no-lockout pledge of labor and management has been 'kept at a rate of 99%,' stated the Secretary of Labor in a report to Congress, commenting 'This is a good record in any field of human relations.' No strike has been authorized since Pearl Harbor by the national leadership of either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

"The prominence given in the press to accounts of strikes has sometimes tended to overshadow the positive achievement of labor in the war effort. Some newspapers commented editorially on this question. Here is a good example:

> "'Undoubtedly press reports have tended to dramatize, and perhaps overplay the occasional stoppages that have occurred in war production. It is precisely because these are extraordinary that they are newsworthy. It is a good deal more difficult to make good copy out of the day-to-day story of devoted effort in the mines and mills. Yet, the record attests that, in the main, this devotion has been very high. There is simply no other basis on which the miracle of American production can be explained.'"

In discussing the practical results of cooperation on the production front, the Army Fact Sheet says:

"General Eisenhower has said: 'Thank God for American industry—labor and management—which has given us the weapons and equipment with which to conduct our North African campaign.' Today, in every campaign, that statement is even more true. A partial tally sheet of war production up to January 1944 includes:

171,257	planes (up to May 1, 1944)
57,000	tanks
1,623,000	machine guns
7,506,500	rifles and carbines
31,000,000,000	rounds of small arms ammunition
30,500	pieces of self-propelled artillery
1,899	liberty ships
746	combatant naval ships
28,286	subsidiary naval ships, including 23,867 landing craft
1,567,940	military trucks

"The mounting peak of airplane production reached the total of 9,118 in March 1944.

"The job has been to supply not only our troops but also the soldiers of our Allies of the United Nations so that the enemy can be crushed wherever found. A substantial number of General Sherman tanks, supplied to the British under Lend-Lease, played a conspicuous part in the British victory at El Alamein. 'Without American supply,' Marshal Stalin has said, 'we could not have won our war.'"

After pointing out the considerable increases in the productivity of workers during the war period, the Army publication summarizes the findings of its study and review of the facts as follows:

"The armed forces on the fighting front and the soldiers of production on the home front are all part of one team which must feel bound together in their common effort. 'Our combined forces are air, land and sea power, and home front power,' said General Vandegrift of the Marines, 'without the latter the others are useless. And when we refer to combined operations, let us remember that the coordinated production of supplies and fighting equipment for our fighting men is an essential part of the combination.'

"The 11,000,000 members of the Armed Forces are backed up by 51,000,000 members of the home front army. Of that total over 16,000,000 are women. The workers directly engaged in munitions industries total over 9,000,000, in addition to other industries, agriculture, etc.

"We must realize that our country does not possess unlimited manpower. Our job is twofold: to create a fighting Army and an Army of production not only for ourselves but for our Allies as well. Even without the necessity to accomplish the one, the other itself could not have been tackled without maladjustments, re-training, shiftings, and mobilization of womanpower. But we are doing both jobs at once. And despite difficulties we are accomplishing it. This alone is reason to be proud, because it is an outstanding and unparalled example of democratic strength and unity. It is proof that a determined, free people can outmatch any totalitarian system without becoming slaves.

"No one would assert that personal sacrifice on the home front could approach that on the battlefield, but it should be remembered that the production front also has its casualties. Industrial accidents have cost the nation more lives since Pearl Harbor than have been lost so far on the battlefronts and have deprived the country of more ships than have enemy submarines.

"Industrial casualties between Pearl Harbor and January 1, 1944, were 37,600 killed (7,500 more than the military dead); 210,000 permanently disabled (60 times more than the military wounded and missing).

"Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, stressed the need for unity of the armed forces and the home front in a recent address in which he said that in division 'between the armed forces and the civilian population—or division between ourselves and our Allies' lies our only possibility of defeat.

"The production front record of management and labor is magnificent—it needs and should have no apology, only publicity and understanding."

NWLB Assailed By Labor For Passing Buck To FDR

Text Of Labor's Dissent

Washington, D. C.—The labor members of the National War Labor Board issued a stinging blast against the NWLB majority decision to make no recommendations to the President on revision of the Little Steel formula. Text of their statement follows:

"The action of the Board is an inexcusable dereliction of duty.

"The program which it has proposed is compounded of timidity, contradictions, and double-talk.

"For more than a year now the Board has had before it, by way of petition, as well as specific cases, requests for modification of the Little Steel formula and other aspects of the Board's stabilization policy. Time and again the Board has given to the workers of America clear indication that when evidence was presented to it, the Board would take these requests under consideration and would make appropriate recommendations to the President based thereon. On March 22, 1944, the Board, by resolution, stated specifically, in part, that 'the Board can only recommend a change if in its judgment the (Little Steel) formula is operating to create gross inequities, and if the Board is satisfied that changes could be made in the formula which would be consistent with the stabilization needs of the country and with the provisions of the Act of October 2, 1942.' This resolution, as well as the action of the Board in accepting the evidence in all the cases presented to it on the matter, was a clear undertaking that the Board would exercise its judgment upon such evidence. The resolution adopted today, however, is a clear surrender of the Board's commitment to exercise its judgment. It is an indefensible demonstration of timidity by men who are charged with the duty of advising the President of any changes which the present situation may require.

"The Board says, first, that in regard to the Little Steel formula it will report to the President, through the Economic Stabilization Director, only pertinent facts regarding the relationship of wages to the cost of living, and an appraisal of the nature and extent of alleged inequities created by those changes. The Board asserts that it cannot go beyond presenting such data and such appraisal because it is not sufficiently informed as to the possible effects of a modification of the formula on the price structure and on the national economy generally. This is tantamount to an admission by the public members of the Board that they are not competent to perform their duties. They are specifically charged with the responsibility of administering the wage policy of the government, and they ought to be in a better position than any other single group of men in the country to have informed opinions as to any necessary changes in the country's wage policy.

"Yet the same public members, who on the one hand plead lack of information, are ready to make pertinent recommendations on wage policies for the reconversion period. They declare that they will proceed to a consideration of any changes that may be required in the so-called bracket system and substandard wages and any other pressing wage problems which confront the Board with respect to reconversion. The Board is prepared thereupon to make any suggestions for broadening or clarifying the Board's authority in dealing with specific inequities and with the reconversion problems. The Board's inconsistency is astounding. For over two years now the Board has been handling cases and becoming fully informed of the effect of the Little Steel formula and the relationship of wages to the cost of living. It has accumulated a mass of evidence on the subject. But the Board now says it is in no position to make any recommendations as a result of that experience and any changes in our economy which have taken place. The Board feels fully competent, however, to make recommendations on matters which have not yet occurred, matters on which it has had no experience, heard no cases, and been in no position to make any more than a guess.

"The only conclusion we can draw on the action of the Board today is that it deems that no change in the Little Steel formula should be recommended. It is apparent to us that the Board simply adopted this subterfuge in order to postpone and delay what it considers an unpalatable decision. There is no excuse for such delay. The wage earners of this country are entitled to know, and to know now, in direct and specific language, what this Board intends to recommend to the President.

"By dodging this responsibility with a promise of another fact-finding report, the Board has demonstrated a timidity unworthy of men charged with so important a phase of our war activities. The President has relied upon the Board to advise him in matters affecting wage stabilization. At a crucial moment in the administration of that policy, the Board has failed him."

Labor's Role In Relief To Italy Stressed At Columbus Day Dinner

New York City.—The role of American labor in helping to reestablish democracy firmly in Italy highlighted discussion at the Columbus Day dinner of the Italian-American Labor Council, attended by 2,500 workers, at the Hotel Commodore.

Another feature of the dinner was the radio addresses of President Roosevelt and Premier Ivanoe Bonomi of Italy. Luigi Antonini, Vice President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, presented the Italian-American Labor Council's "Four Freedoms Award" to President Roosevelt. The award was accepted in behalf of the President by Attorney General Biddle.

The labor speakers were Mr. Antonini and Matthew Woll, Vice President of the AFL and chairman of the Labor League for Human Rights.

Mr. Woll stressed the need for helping Italy in the task of her political and economic rehabilitation as an essential element in the larger problem of re-establishing a stable world equilibrium. Making allowance for the primary consideration required by the military situation, Mr. Woll said that "we must at the same time recognize that the record of the Allies in relation to Italian civilian affairs is one of failure in important respects, a failure which we hope will not be repeated elsewhere in Europe."

He expressed hope that the aid promised to Italy by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration through an appropriation of $50,000,000, and the more recent survey of the situation in that country ordered by President Roosevelt would prove the beginning of a more adequate policy.

Mr. Woll emphasized the desire of the AFL to help restore a democratic trade union movement in Italy and in all countries where unions have been destroyed by the Germans, saying that the revival of free trade unionism was essential in rebuilding democracy in all countries. In this connection Mr. Woll mentioned the program of the Free Trade Union Committee created by the Labor League for Human Rights, relief arm of the AFL, calling for raising a fund of at least $1,000,000 to help finance the work.

In his address Mr. Antonini told of his observations during a recent trip to Italy.

Appeals Court Voids Injunction Against Boycott By Electricians

Washington, D. C.—Citing United States Supreme Court precedents, the Circuit Court of Appeals set aside an injunction and declaratory judgment that had been issued by the Federal District Court against a boycott enforced by Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers against 11 electrical manufacturers.

In effect, the court's decision legalized the boycott through which Local 3 of the IBEW, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, excludes from the New York City market products made outside the city by concerns with which it has no contracts. Most of the products are those used in construction work.

A 2-to-1 decision, written by Judge Charles Clark, with Judge Augustus N. Hand concurring, cites the Supreme Court decisions in the cases of the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, the International Hod Carriers and what was termed the "controlling case" of the American Federation of Musicians.

"These cases," the majority decision said, "are too closely similar to the case at bar, indeed going beyond it in some aspects, to permit the broad adjudication of illegality here and the injunction based upon it to stand."

The case on which decision was rendered dates back to December, 1935, when the 11 electrical manufacturing concerns, including General Electric, Westinghouse and Allis-Chalmers, filed suit for the injunction and also asked for treble damages under the Sherman Act. This last issue had remained pending in district court without trial.

Upon agreement between the parties the issues were referred to a special master, John Kirkland Clark, who after examining 400 witnesses and 1,700 exhibits recommended an injunction to break the boycott. His findings were substantially accepted last year by the district court, which issued the injunction.

Labor Members Charge Board Has Failed In Its Duty To Rule On Wages

Washington, D. C.—Organized labor, bitterly assailing the cowardly refusal of the National War Labor Board to recommend any change in the wage-freeze to the President, will draw up its own recommendations and present them directly to the White House.

The NWLB, after spending more than a year in considering the issues at stake, decided by an 8 to 4 vote, with all labor members dissenting, to pass the buck.

It attempted to justify its timidity by asserting it was unable to judge what effect a change in the Little Steel formula would have on the price structure of the country.

"This is tantamount to an admission by the public members of the Board that they are not competent to perform their duties," the labor members hotly countered.

The net effect of the action—or inaction— of the Board will be to delay the final decision of the President. The Board now intends to draw up "pertinent facts" regarding the relationship of wages to the cost of living and an appraisal of the nature and extent of alleged inequities created by those changes.

After this "statement of facts" is prepared, it will be submitted to Economic Stabilization Director Vinson. Presumably, Mr. Vinson, who has been quoted as saying privately in Washington circles that there will be no change in the Little Steel formula, will then consider the NWLB statement, draw up one of his own and, in turn, pass the whole works on to the President.

This time-consuming process is expected to delay any possible decision by the President until after election. AFL and CIO leaders have protested against such delays.

The resolution adopted by the public and industry members of the Board said:

"The board is not sufficiently informed as to the possible effects of a modification of the Little Steel formula or the price structure and on the national economy generally to warrant assurance that any modification could be made 'consistent with the stabilization needs of the country and with the provisions of the act of Oct. 2, 1942,' (as renewed by the Economic Stabilization Renewal Act of June, 1944).

"The board will, therefore, not include in its factual report to the President any recommendations for action one way or the other with regard to the Little Steel formula."

Earlier the board voted down, 8 to 4, an AFL resolution placed before it that the President be requested to issue an Executive order "which will realistically adjust the wage stabilization policy of the Government with the increased cost of living and permit employers and employes to effectuate the newly established policy by voluntary agreement without submission to the NWLB."

The labor members, pointing out that the board had had before it for more than a year specific requests for modification of the Little Steel formula, asserted that "time and again the board has given to the workers of America clear indication that when evidence was presented to it the board would take these requests under consideration and would make appropriate recommendations to the President based thereon."

They recalled that on March 22, 1944, the board had said that it could recommend a change in the Little Steel formula if the formula created "gross inequities." This resolution, the labor statement maintained, "was a clear undertaking that the board would exercise its judgment upon such evidence." But the final action was "a clear surrender of the board's commitment to exercise its judgment."

FREEMAN ELECTED TO IBEW POSITION

Washington, D. C.—Gordon Freeman has been elected a vice president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Arthur Bennett of Cleveland, who had served in that post for nearly 20 years before retiring because of ill health.

Mr. Freeman has been an international representative of the Brotherhood since 1929 and for the past 8 years has also served as secretary of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council. In that position, he took a prominent part in the development of model relations between the TVA and the AFL unions representing employes on the project. He has been active, too, in many phases of labor-management cooperation on TVA.

NAME LIBERTY SHIP FOR JOSEPH McDONAGH

Savannah, Ga.—A Liberty ship bearing the name of Joseph McDonagh, late secretary-treasurer of the AFL Metal Trades Department, will soon slide down the ways of the Southeastern Shipbuilding Corp.

The Maritime Commission announced the naming of the vessel after McDonagh as a tribute to his years of service to the cause of labor. He died several months ago at the age of 66.